

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.,
09/233,073	01/19/1999	KENICHI NANBU	033082W001	8021
7:	590 02/10/2004		EXAM	IINER
SMITH GAMBRELL & RUSSELL			VINH, LAN	
BEVERIDGE I	DEGRANDI WEILAC	HER & YOUNG		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1850 M STREET N W SHITE 800			1745	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>.</u>	₹¢	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	000 000	09/233,073	NANBU ET AL.	
-	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Lan Vinh	1765	
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence add	ress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION, insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr , cause the application to become ABANDC	e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this con	nmunication.
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 O</u>	ctober 2003		
2a)□		action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the i	merits is
•	closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposit	ion of Claims		,	
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-10,12 and 15-22</u> is/are pending	in the application		
٠,٣٣	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			•
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) 1-6,8-10,12 and 15-22 is/are rejected.		·	
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Applicati	on Papers			
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r .		
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	·	e Examiner	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	-		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			₹ 1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Offic	ce Action or form PTC)-152.
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) 🖂	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:1 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received		
	2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents		ation No. 00/222 072	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori			tane
	application from the International Bureau		voa III alio Mational Ol	lago
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of		ved.	
				<i>'</i>
∧ttachmo=	(6)			
Attachment 1) ⊠ Notice	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa	ny (PTO 442)	
2) 🔲 Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date	•
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-1	52)
		3) 🗀 Oulet	<u>. </u>	

Application/Control Number: 09/233,073

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Szwejkowski et al (US 5,338,398)

Szwejkowski discloses a RIE process that uses chlorine gas as an etchant at a flow rate of approximately 13.3 sccm per liter (see col 4, lines 15-25). This flow rate according to the applicants, is useful for producing " a flow diverging position with respect to an outer periphery of an object being etched that is substantially at or internal to the outer periphery of the object being etched (page 7 of the specification).

Szwejkowski also discloses converting chlorine gas into a plasma that can be used to etch polysilicon (col 4, lines 22-25 and 38-40). Szwejkowski further discloses that its RIE process is performed in a vacuum apparatus such as the one disclosed in Cheng (Cheng is incorporated by reference at col 2, line 40 of Szwejkowski). Cheng discloses a magnetic filed enhanced plasma etch reactor used for RIE processes, such as those described in Szwejkowski (col 1, lines 10-16). The reactor has a plasma producing chamber (area 110) and a reaction chamber (areas where a wafer 75 is located, together with a evacuation system 106, a gas inlet system 81 and a clamping ring 78 (col 8, lines 3-12, fig. 7). The plasma producing chamber is supplied with RF energy to

Application/Control Number: 09/233,073

Art Unit: 1765

convert an etchant into a plasma useful for etching the wafer (col 5, lines 53-56; col 8, lines 5-11). Szwejkowski further discloses that the pressure in the etch chamber may range about 10 mTorr-100 mTorr (col 3, lines 33-34), which overlaps the claimed range of 5-10 mTorr)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al (US 5,556,501)

Collins discloses an ICP etching process that use chlorine gas to etch polysilicon (col 3, lines 40-50; col 22, lines 44-50). The plasma is initially formed by applying RF (radio frequency) power to chlorine gas in a first chamber (col 3, lines 45-48). The etching reaction occurs in the second chamber equipped with a vacuum system after the plasma is introduced (col 7, lines 39-45). The pressure of the first and second chamber are maintained between 2-20 mTorr (col 22, lines 44-50), which overlaps the claimed range of 5-10 mTorr

Collins does not specifically disclose applying the etching gas at a rate/flow rate that fall within the claimed range 8.4 sccm to 16.9 sccm/ a flow rate which produces a flow diverging position with respect to an outer periphery of an object being etched that is

Application/Control Number: 09/233,073

Art Unit: 1765

substantially at or internal to the outer periphery of the object being etched (according to page 7 of the specification).

However, throughout the disclosure, Collins emphasizes the importance of the flow rate of the etching gas in the ICP process. Collins, for example, employ multiple gas injection sources, with one exemplified flow rate of 50 cc to enhance the ICP etching process (col 9, lines 64-67; col 10, lines 1-5). Collins also discloses the use of a controller to monitor the condition during the ICP etching process, with such controller being geared to regulate the gas flow rate (col 18, lines 1-5). Thus, Collins serves as evidence that the flow rate is a result effective variable. It follows that the optimization of a result effective variable (flow rate) in the ICP process of Collins is deemed to be well within the ambit of one skilled in the art In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16

USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980) (holding that optimization is obvious when the variable to be optimized is recognized as a result effective variable)

The limitations of claims 2, 5,12, 15-22 have been discussed above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 15-22 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1765

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lan Vinh whose telephone number is 571 272 1471. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571 272 1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LV

February 2, 2004